

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\* TX REPORT \*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO 3543  
RECIPIENT ADDRESS 919723857766  
DESTINATION ID  
ST. TIME 11/05 17:02  
TIME USE 02'09.  
PAGES SENT 4  
RESULT OK



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

## FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE: 11-5-07

TO: Louise Fax  
(NAME)

972-385-7766  
(FACSIMILE NUMBER)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(ORGANIZATION)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(TELEPHONE NUMBER)

SENDER: K Creasy  
(NAME)

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES 4 (INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE)

NOTE: The facsimile number shown on this cover is for informal/courtesy copies ONLY!!!!  
If you have not received all pages or you have any questions about this transmission, please  
contact the OFFICE OF PETITIONS as follows:



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

# FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE: 11-5-07

TO: Louise Fax  
(NAME)

972-385-7766  
(FACSIMILE NUMBER)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(ORGANIZATION)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(TELEPHONE NUMBER)

SENDER: K Creasy  
(NAME)

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES 4 (INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE)

NOTE: The facsimile number shown on this cover is for **informal/courtesy copies ONLY!!!!**  
If you have not received all pages or you have any questions about this transmission, please  
contact the **OFFICE OF PETITIONS** as follows:

DIRECT TELEPHONE NO.: 571-272-3282

FACSIMILE NO. 571-273-0025

BRIEF MESSAGE:

Per your request  
Copy of decision.  
Note change in number.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

IBM CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
11400 BURNET ROAD  
AUSTIN TX 78758

COPY MAILED

SEP. 05 2007

In re Application of  
Jimmy Ming-Der Hsu  
Application No. 09/965,145  
Filed: September 27, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. AUS920010508US1

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) filed March 15, 2007, requesting revival of the above-identified application.

The petition is dismissed.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time (and fee) under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)."

This application became abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue and publication fee on or before November 24, 2004, in reply to the Notice of Allowance mailed August 24, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on January 13, 2004.

A grantable petition to revive an abandoned application under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply (unless previously filed), which may met by the filing of a continuing application in a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, but must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof in an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof; (2) the petition fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) an adequate statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) in some instances, a terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)). This petition lacks item (4) above.

35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) authorizes the Commissioner to accept a petition "for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent." As amended December 1, 1997, 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) provides that a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by a statement that the delay was unintentional, but provides that "[t]he Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional." Where

there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, the petitioner must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unintentional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b). See In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989). Here in view of the inordinate delay in the attempt to resuming prosecution, there is a question whether the entire delay was unintentional. Petitioner should note that the issue is not whether some of the delay was unintentional by any party; rather, the issue is whether the entire delay has been shown to the satisfaction of the Director to be unintentional.

The language of both 35 USC 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b) are clear and unambiguous, and furthermore, without qualification. That is, the delay in filing the reply during prosecution, as well as in filing the petition seeking revival, must have been, without qualification, "unintentional" for the reply to now be accepted on petition. The Office requires that the entire delay be at least unintentional as a prerequisite to revival of an abandoned application to prevent abuse and injury to the public. See H.R. Rep. No. 542, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 771 ("[i]n order to prevent abuse and injury to the public the Commissioner . . . could require applicants to act promptly after becoming aware of the abandonment"). The December 1997 change to 37 CFR 1.137 did not create any new right to overcome an intentional delay in seeking revival, or in renewing an attempt at seeking revival, of an abandoned application. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53160 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 87 (October 21, 1997); and clearly stated clear that any protracted delay could trigger, as here, a request for additional information. As the courts have since made clear, a protracted delay in seeking revival, as here, requires a detailed explanation that will excuse the delay as opposed to a general allegation. See Lawman Armor v. Simon, 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 10843, 74 USPQ2d 1633, at 1637-8 (DC EMich 2005); Field Hybrids, LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp., 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1159 (D. Minn Jan. 27, 2005) at \*21-\*23.

The file does not indicate a change of address has been submitted, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. If appropriate, a change of address should be filed in accordance with MPEP 601.03. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address given on the petition; however, the Office will mail all future correspondence solely to the address of record.

Any renewed petition may be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS  
Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314:

By fax: (571) 273-8300  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Inquiries related to this decision may be made to the undersigned at (571) 272-<sup>3208</sup>~~3217~~.

*Karen Creasy*

Karen Creasy  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

CC:

**IBM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW**  
**11400 BURNET ROAD**  
**AUSTIN, TX 78758**